

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 4-6 are currently pending in this application, as amended. By the present amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled, and new claims 5 and 6 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In response, Applicants have amended claim 4 in order to provide proper antecedents for the front and rear axles. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by GB 2 327 916 to Dias. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a transport cart with front and rear rollers, all of which can be steered. Antitheft protection is provided that can be activated automatically as soon as the cart is located outside a permissible area. The anti-theft protection includes at least one of the front rollers and at least one of the rear rollers being fixable in pre-determined steering positions corresponding to a blocking angle, and upon activation, the anti-theft protection automatically moves the rollers into the steering position corresponding to the blocking angle.

Dias discloses a trolley with front and rear rollers, all of which can be steered, in which all of the rollers are fixable in various positions via automatic triggering of the wheel direction locking mechanisms located on all wheels when the trolley leaves the boundaries of its premises. See page 2, paragraph 2, last four lines. There is no suggestion or disclosure that the rollers automatically move to the fixed blocking angle. The Dias device provides for a multiple of locking positions at each of the wheel and there is nothing that requires the rollers to be fixed at steering positions that

correspond to the blocking position. Rather, upon activation the rollers of Dias are clamped in their then current position, rather than different pre-determined fixed steering positions between the front and back rollers.

In view of these differences, withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Dias and U.S. 6,271,755 to Prather. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and further recites that one of the front rollers is mounted at a front axle and is fixable in a position at a diagonal angle in reference to the longitudinal axis of the transport cart, and one of the rear rollers is mounted at a rear axle and is fixable in a position at a straight steering angle in reference to the longitudinal axis of the transport cart.

As noted above Dias lacks the teaching of any specific pre-determined steering positions for the front and rear rollers corresponding to a blocking angle and locks them in their then current position upon activation. Prather fails to address this for two reasons. First, the Prather shopping cart includes fixed rear wheels which are always maintained in the same position. Second, the pivotable front wheels (26) of the Prather cart are never fixed in position, but rather are mounted for movement into and out of a ground contact position and, upon movement out of ground contact, the cart rests on fixed front rollers (62, 64) which are angled relative to the rear rollers. Thus, there is still no suggestion or teaching of the rollers being fixable in steering positions corresponding to a blocking angle.

With respect to new claims 5 and 6, these recite further aspects of the present invention which are neither suggested nor disclosed by the prior art.


CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application, including Claims 1 and 4-6, is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Wieth et al.

By 
Randolph J. Huis
Registration No. 34,626
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
RJH/dmm